arXiv:1208.6212v1 [math.AP] 30 Aug 2012

A DYNAMICAL APPROACH TO THE LARGE-TIME BEHAVIOR OF SOLUTIONS TO WEAKLY COUPLED SYSTEMS OF HAMILTON–JACOBI EQUATIONS

HIROYOSHI MITAKE AND HUNG V. TRAN

Abstract. We investigate the large-time behavior of the value functions of the optimal control problems on the n-dimensional torus which appear in the dynamic programming for the system whose states are governed by random changes. From the point of view of the study on partial differential equations, it is equivalent to consider viscosity solutions of quasi-monotone weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations. The large-time behavior of viscosity solutions of this problem has been recently studied by the authors and Camilli, Ley, Loreti, and Nguyen for some special cases, independently, but the general cases remain widely open. We establish a convergence result to asymptotic solutions as time goes to infinity under rather general assumptions by using dynamical properties of value functions.

1. Introduction and Main Result

In this paper we deal with optimal control problems, or calculus of variations, which appear in the dynamic programming for the system whose states are governed by random changes. More precisely, we consider the minimizing problem:

$$\text{Minimize}\quad \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + g_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big], \tag{1.1}$$

over all controls $\gamma\in \mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$ with $\gamma(0)=x$ for any fixed $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$, where the Lagrangians $L_i(x,p):\mathbb{T}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ are derived from the Fenchel-Legendre transforms of given Hamiltonians H_i and we denote by $\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$ the set of absolutely continuous functions on $[-t,0]$ with values in $\mathbb{T}^n$. The functions g_i are given real-valued continuous functions on $\mathbb{T}^n$ for $i=1,2$. Here $\mathbb{E}_i$ denotes the expectation of a process with $\nu(0)=i$, where ν is a $\{1,2\}$-valued process which is a continuous-time Markov chain on $(-\infty,0]$ (notice that time is reversed) such that for $s\le 0$, $\Delta s>0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\nu(s-\Delta s)=j\mid \nu(s)=i\big)=c_i\Delta s+o(\Delta s)\ \text{as}\ \Delta s\to 0\ \text{for}\ i\neq j, \tag{1.2}$$

where c_i are given positive constants and $o:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ is a function satisfying $o(r)/r\to 0$ as $r\to 0$. We call the minimizing costs of (1.1) the *value functions* of optimal control problems (1.1).

Date: August 31, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B40, 35F55, 49L25.

Key words and phrases. Large-time Behavior; Hamilton–Jacobi Equations; Weakly Coupled Systems; Ergodic Problem; Switching Cost Problems; Piecewise-deterministic Markov processes; Viscosity Solutions.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the large-time behavior of the value functions. From the point of view of partial differential equations it is equivalent to study that of viscosity solutions of quasi-monotone weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations

$$\text{(C)}\qquad \begin{cases} (u_1)_t + H_1(x, Du_1) + c_1(u_1 - u_2) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n \times (0,\infty),\\ (u_2)_t + H_2(x, Du_2) + c_2(u_2 - u_1) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n \times (0,\infty),\\ u_i(x,0) = g_i(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{T}^n, \end{cases}$$

where the Hamiltonians $H_i(x,p) : \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ are given continuous functions for $i = 1, 2$, which are assumed throughout the paper to satisfy the followings.

(A1) The functions H_i are uniformly coercive in the x-variable, i.e.,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \inf\{H_i(x,p) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n, |p| \geq r\} = \infty.$$

(A2) The functions $p \mapsto H_i(x,p)$ are strictly convex for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$.

Here u_i are real-valued unknown functions on $\mathbb{T}^n \times [0,\infty)$ and $(u_i)_t = \partial u_i/\partial t$, $Du_i = (\partial u_i/\partial x_1, \ldots, \partial u_i/\partial x_n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, respectively. We are only dealing with viscosity solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations here and thus the term "viscosity" will be omitted henceforth.

The existence and uniqueness results for weakly coupled systems (C) of Hamilton–Jacobi equations have been established by [6, 9]. In recent years, there have been many studies on the properties of viscosity solutions of weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations. See [3, 11, 12, 4] for instance. In particular, the studies on large-time behaviors were done for some special cases by the authors [11], and Camilli, Ley, Loreti and Nguyen [4], independently. However, the general cases remain widely open and the techniques developed in [11, 4] are not applicable for general cases. The coupling terms cause serious difficulties, which will be explained in details later.

Let us first recall the heuristic derivation of the large-time asymptotics for (C) discussed by the authors [11] for readers' convenience. We use the same notations as in [11]. For simplicity, we assume that $c_1 = c_2 = 1$ henceforth. Formal asymptotic expansions of the solutions u_1, u_2 of (C) are considered to be of the forms

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(x,t) &= a_{01}(x)t + a_{11}(x) + a_{21}(x)t^{-1} + \ldots,\\ u_2(x,t) &= a_{02}(x)t + a_{12}(x) + a_{22}(x)t^{-1} + \ldots \quad . \end{aligned}$$

as $t \to \infty$. Then (C) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &a_{01}(x) - a_{21}(x)t^{-2} + \ldots + H_1(x, Da_{01}(x)t + Da_{11}(x) + Da_{21}(x)t^{-1} + \ldots)\\ &+(a_{01}(x) - a_{02}(x))t + (a_{11}(x) - a_{12}(x)) + (a_{21}(x) - a_{22}(x))t^{-1} + \ldots = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &a_{02}(x) - a_{22}(x)t^{-2} + \ldots + H_2(x, Da_{02}(x)t + Da_{12}(x) + Da_{22}(x)t^{-1} + \ldots)\\ &+(a_{02}(x) - a_{01}(x))t + (a_{12}(x) - a_{11}(x)) + (a_{22}(x) - a_{21}(x))t^{-1} + \ldots = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Sum up (1.3) and (1.4) to yield

$$H_1(x, Da_{01}t + Da_{11} + O(1/t)) + H_2(x, Da_{02}t + Da_{12} + O(1/t)) + O(1) = 0$$

as $t \to \infty$. Hence we formally get $Da_{01} = Da_{02} \equiv 0$ by the coercivity of H_1 and H_2. We next let $t \to \infty$ in (1.3), (1.4) to achieve that $a_{01}(x) = a_{02}(x) \equiv a_0$ for some constant $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\begin{cases} H_1(x, Da_{11}(x)) + a_{11}(x) - a_{12}(x) = -a_0, \\ H_2(x, Da_{12}(x)) + a_{12}(x) - a_{11}(x) = -a_0, \end{cases}$$

in $\mathbb{T}^n$. It is then natural to study the ergodic problem

$$\text{(E)} \qquad \begin{cases} H_1(x, Dv_1(x)) + v_1 - v_2 = c & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n, \\ H_2(x, Dv_2(x)) + v_2 - v_1 = c & \text{in } \mathbb{T}^n. \end{cases}$$

We here seek for a triplet $(v_1, v_2, c) \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ such that (v_1, v_2) is a solution of (E). If (v_1, v_2, c) is such a triplet, we call (v_1, v_2) a *pair of ergodic functions* and c an *ergodic constant*. It was proved in [3, 11] that there exists a unique constant c such that the ergodic problem (E) has continuous solutions (v_1, v_2).

Hence, our goal in this paper is to prove the following large-time asymptotics for (C).

Theorem 1.1 (Main Result)**.** *Assume that* (A1), (A2) *hold. For any* $(g_1, g_2) \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)^2$ *there exists a solution* $(v_1, v_2, c) \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ *of* (E) *such that*

$$u_i(x,t) + ct - v_i(x) \to 0 \quad \textit{uniformly on } \mathbb{T}^n \textit{ as } t \to \infty \tag{1.5}$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

In the last decade, the large time behavior of solutions of single Hamilton–Jacobi equations,

$$u_t + H(x, Du) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^n \times (0, \infty), \tag{1.6}$$

where H is coercive, has received much attention and general convergence results for solutions have been established. The first general result was discovered by Namah and Roquejoffre in [13] under the following additional assumptions: $p \mapsto H(x, p)$ is convex, and

$$H(x, p) \geq H(x, 0) \text{ for all } (x, p) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } \max_{\mathcal{M}} H(x, 0) = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary. Then Fathi used dynamical system approach from weak KAM theory in [7] to establish the same type of convergence result, which requires uniform convexity (and smoothness) assumptions on $H(x, \cdot)$, i.e., $D_{pp}H(x, p) \geq \alpha I$ for all $(x, p) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\alpha > 0$ but does not require the specific structure (1.7) of Hamiltonians. Afterwards Roquejoffre [14], Davini and Siconolfi in [5], Ishii in [8] refined and generalized the approach of Fathi and they studied the asymptotic problem for Hamilton–Jacobi equations on $\mathcal{M}$ or the whole n-dimensional Euclidean space. Besides, Barles and Souganidis [1] also obtained this type of results, for possibly non-convex Hamiltonians, by using a PDE method in the context of viscosity solutions.

In the previous paper [11], the authors could establish Theorem 1.1 only in two main specific cases. In the first case, we generalized the approach in [13] and obtain convergence result under additional assumptions similar to (1.7) (see also [4]). The second case is a generalization of [1] under the strong assumption that $H_1 = H_2 = H$, where H satisfies similar assumptions as in [1]. We could not obtain Theorem 1.1 in its full generality because of the appearance of the coupling terms $u_1 - u_2$ and $u_2 - u_1$.

In this paper we develop a dynamical approach to weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations which is inspired by the works by Davini, Siconolfi [5] and Ishii [8], and establish Theorem 1.1 in its full generality. The results in [7, 14, 5] can be viewed as a particular case of Theorem 1.1 when $H_1 = H_2$, and $g_1 = g_2$. As we consider system (C), we need to take random switchings among the two states in (1.1) into account, which does never appear in the context of single Hamilton-Jacobi equations. The key ingredients in this approach consist of obtaining existence and stability results of extremal curves of (1.1). It is fairly straightforward to prove the existence of extremal curves by using techniques from calculus of variations. However, representation formulas (1.1) are implicit in some sense and prevent us from deriving a stability result (see Theorem 4.1). In order to over come this difficulty, we give more deterministic formulas for the value functions of (1.1) by explicit calculations in Theorem 2.4. By using the new formulas, which are more intuitive, we are able to derive Theorem 4.1, and hence large time behavior results.

Let us call attention to the forthcoming paper [2] by Cagnetti, Gomes and the authors, which provides a completely new approach to the study of large time behaviors of both single and weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations. A new and different proof of Theorem 1.1 is derived as well.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish new representation formulas, which are more explicit and useful for our study here. We then derive the existence of extremal curves in Section 3, which is pretty standard in the theory of optimal control and calculus of variations. Section 4 concerns the study of stability of extremal curves. This section plays the key roles in this paper and allows us to overcome the technical difficulties coming from the coupling terms. See Remarks 4.4 and 4.5 for details. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, some lemmata concerning verifications of optimal control formulas for (C) in Section 2 are recorded in Appendix for readers' convenience.

Acknowledgement. The authors are grateful to Professor Toshio Mikami for discussions which has been of help for them to come to Theorem 2.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we establish new representation formulas, which give us a clearer intuition about the switching states of the systems. The new formulas allow us to perform deep studies on the extremal curves in Sections 3, and 4.

Lemma 2.1. *Let ν be a Markov process defined by* (1.2) *with $c_1 = c_2 = 1$ and set $p_j(t) := \mathbb{P}(\nu(t) = j)$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Then we have*

$$p_j(t) = 1/2 + e^{2t}(p_j(0) - 1/2) \text{ for all } t < 0.$$

In particular, $p_j(t) \to 1/2$ as $t \to -\infty$ for any $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. Set $\mu(dx) := -(\delta_1(dx) + \delta_2(dx))$, where δ_j are the Dirac measures at the points j, for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, respectively. For any measurable function f and $i = 1, 2$, by the Itô formula we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_i[f(\nu(t))] &= f(i) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int (f(\beta) - f(\nu(s)))\,\mu(d\beta)\Big]\,ds\\ &= f(i) + \int_0^t -\Big\{\mathbb{P}(\nu(s) = 1)\cdot(f(2) - f(1)) + \mathbb{P}(\nu(s) = 2)\cdot(f(1) - f(2))\Big\}\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

If we take $f(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{j\}}(x)$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, where $\mathbf{1}_{\{j\}}$ is the characteristic function of $\{j\}$, then we have

$$p_j(t) = p_j(0) + \int_0^t -\big\{p_j(s)\cdot(-1) + (1 - p_j(s))\cdot 1\big\}\,ds = p_j(0) + \int_0^t (2p_j(s) - 1)\,ds.$$

Therefore, we get $p_j(t) = 1/2 + e^{2t}(p_j(0) - 1/2)$ for all $t < 0$. □

A straightforward result of Lemma 2.1 is

Lemma 2.2. *Let ϕ_i be any functions in $C(\mathbb{T}^n)$ for $i = 1, 2$. We have*

$$\mathbb{E}_i[\phi_{\nu(t)}(x)] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{2t})\phi_i(x) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{2t})\phi_j(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $t < 0$, and $i = 1, 2$, where we take j so that $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$.

Remark 2.3. In general if $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are arbitrary constants, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_i[\phi_{\nu(t)}(x)] = \frac{1}{c_1 + c_2}(c_j + c_i e^{(c_1+c_2)t})\phi_i(x) + \frac{c_i}{c_1 + c_2}(1 - e^{(c_1+c_2)t})\phi_j(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $t < 0$, and $i = 1, 2$, where we take j so that $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$.

It turns out that the value function of optimal control problems (1.1) can be written in more explicit forms without using continuous Markov chains as follows by using the Fubini theorem.

Theorem 2.4. *Let u_i be the value functions defined by* (1.1)*. Then we can write them as*

$$\begin{aligned}u_i(x, t) = \inf\Big\{ &\int_{-t}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s), \dot\gamma(s))\,ds + \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{-2t})g_i(\gamma(-t))\\ + &\int_{-t}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s), \dot\gamma(s))\,ds + \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2t})g_j(\gamma(-t)) \ \Big|\ \gamma \in \mathrm{AC}([-t, 0]),\ \gamma(0) = x\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, u_i are uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{T}^n \times [0, \infty)$ and the pair (u_1, u_2) is the unique viscosity solution of (C).

We call $(1/2)(1+e^{2s})$ and $(1/2)(1-e^{2s})$ for $s<0$ *the weights* corresponding to (C), which comes from the random switchings among the two states in (1.1).

Proof. By Fubini's theorem and Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+g_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big]\\
&=\int_{-t}^{0}\mathbb{E}_i\Big[L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\Big]\,ds+\mathbb{E}_i\big[g_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\big]\\
&=\int_{-t}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2t})g_i(\gamma(-t))\\
&\quad+\int_{-t}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2t})g_j(\gamma(-t))
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma\in \mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$, which implies the equality (2.1).

In Appendix we prove that u_i are uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$ and the pair (u_1,u_2) gives a solution of (C). In the previous paper [12], we showed that the pair (u_1,u_2) defined by (1.1) solves (C) already. But we present it in a different way by using the new formula (2.1) itself to make the paper self-contained. □

Let $(v_1,v_2,0)$ be a solution of (E). Without loss of generality, we may assume that the ergodic constant $c=0$ henceforth. We notice that v_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
v_i(x)=\inf\Big\{&\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big]\mid\\
&\gamma\in \mathrm{AC}\,((-\infty,0])\text{ with }\gamma(0)=x\Big\},
\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

where ν is a $\{1,2\}$-valued process which is a continuous-time Markov chain satisfying (1.2) such that $\nu(0)=i$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $(v_1,v_2,0)$ *be a subsolution of* (E). *Then,*

$$v_i(x)\le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big]$$

for all $t\ge0$, $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$ *with* $\gamma(0)=x$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $t>0$, $v_i\in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^n)$ *for* $i=1,2$ *and* $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0],\mathbb{T}^n)$ *with* $\gamma(0)=x$. *We have* $v_i\circ\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$ *and there exists a function* $p_i\in L^\infty((-t,0),\mathbb{R}^n)$ *such that*

$$v_i(x)=\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} p_{\nu(s)}(s)\cdot\dot\gamma(s)+\sum_{j=1}^{2}(v_{\nu(s)}-v_j)(\gamma(s))\,ds+v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big],\tag{2.3}$$

$p_i(s)\in\partial_c v_i(\gamma(s))$

for a.e. $s \in (-t, 0)$ *and* $i \in \{1, 2\}$. *Here* $\partial_c v_i$ *denotes the Clarke differential of* v_i *which is defined as*

$$\partial_c v_i(x) = \bigcap_{r>0} \overline{\mathrm{co}}\,\{Dv_i(y) \mid y \in B(x, r),\ v_i \textit{ is differentiable at } y\} \quad \textit{for } x \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where $B(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x - y| < r\}$, *and for* $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\overline{\mathrm{co}}\, A$ *denotes the closed convex hull of* A.

Proof. Fix any $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a standard mollification kernel, i.e., $\rho \geq 0$, $\operatorname{supp} \rho \subset B(0, 1)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x)\, dx = 1$. Set $\rho^k(x) := k^n \rho(kx)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\psi^k(i, t) = \psi^k_i(t) := (\rho^k * v_i)(\gamma(t)) \text{ and } p^k(i, t) = p^k_i(t) := D(\rho^k * v_i)(\gamma(t))$$

for all $t \in (0, T)$. By the Itô formula for a jump process we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\psi^k(\nu(0), 0) - \psi^k(\nu(-t), -t)\Big]\\ =\,&\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} p^k(\nu(s), s) \cdot \dot{\gamma}(s)\, ds + \int_{-t}^{0} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \big(\psi^k(j, s) - \psi^k(\nu(s), s)\big)\, ds\Big]\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\psi^k_i \to v_i(\gamma(\cdot))$ uniformly on $[0, t]$ as $k \to \infty$ and moreover passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that for some $p_i \in L^\infty((0, T), \mathbb{R}^n)$, $p^k_i \rightharpoonup p_i$ weakly star in $L^\infty((-t, 0))$ as $k \to \infty$, which implies (2.3).

It remains to show that $p_i(s) \in \partial_c v_i(\gamma(s))$ for a.e. $s \in (-t, 0)$. Since $\{p^k_i\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is weakly convergent to p_i in $L^2((-t, 0), \mathbb{R}^n)$, by the Mazur theorem, there is a sequence $\{q^k_i\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty((-t, 0), \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$q^k_i \to p_i \ \text{ strongly in } L^2((-t, 0), \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ as } k \to \infty,\ q^k_i \in \mathrm{co}\,\{p^j_i \mid j \geq k\} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We may thus assume by its subsequence if necessary that

$$q^k_i(s) \to p_i(s) \ \text{ for } a.e.\ s \in (-t, 0) \ \text{ as } \ k \to \infty.$$

Now, noting that $D(\rho_k * v)(x) = \int_{y\in B(x,1/k)} \rho_k(x - y) Dv_i(y)\, dy$ for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we find that

$$p^k_i(s) \in \overline{\mathrm{co}}\{Dv_i(y) \mid y \in B(\gamma(s), 1/k),\ v_i \text{ is differentiable at } y\}$$

for any $s \in (-t, 0)$. Therefore,

$$q^k_i(s) \in \overline{\mathrm{co}}\{Dv_i(y) \mid y \in B(\gamma(s), 1/k),\ v_i \text{ is differentiable at } y\}$$

for any $s \in (-t, 0)$. Since $q^k_i(s) \to p_i(s)$ for $a.e.$ $s \in (-t, 0)$ as $k \to \infty$, we get

$$p_i(s) \in \bigcap_{r>0} \overline{\mathrm{co}}\{Dv_i(y) \mid y \in B(\gamma(s), r),\ v_i \text{ is differentiable at } y\} = \partial_c v_i(\gamma(s))$$

for $a.e.$ $s \in (-t, 0)$. □

Proof of Proposition 2.5. Let $\gamma \in \mathrm{AC}([-t,0])$ with $\gamma(0)=x$ and p_i be the functions given by Lemma 2.6. In view of Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(x) &= \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} p_{\nu(s)}(s)\cdot\dot\gamma(s) + \sum_{j=1}^{2}(v_{\nu(s)}-v_j)(\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} H_{\nu(s)}(\gamma,p_{\nu(s)}) + L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma,\dot\gamma) + \sum_{j=1}^{2}(v_{\nu(s)}-v_j)(\gamma)\,ds + v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big] \qquad (2.5) \\ &\le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma,\dot\gamma)\,ds + v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t))\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. EXISTENCE OF EXTREMAL CURVES

Let $(v_1,v_2,0)$ be a solution of (E). For any interval $[a,b]\subset(-\infty,0]$, we denote by $\mathcal{E}(([a,b],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$ the set of all curves $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}([a,b])$, which will be called an *extremal curve* on $[a,b]$ such that $\gamma(b)=x$ and for any $[c,d]\subset[a,b]$,

$$\mathbb{E}_i[v_{\nu(d)}(\gamma(d))] = \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_c^d L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(c)}(\gamma(c))\Big]$$

with a continuous-time Markov chain ν such that $\nu(0)=i$ and satisfies (1.2).

Theorem 3.1. *Let (v_1,v_2) be a solution of* (E). *Then $\mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))\neq\emptyset$.*

In order to avoid technical difficulties we make the following additional assumptions in this section which are not necessary to get Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 1.1. We refer the readers to [8, Section 6] for the detail of general settings.

- (A3) $H_i\in C^2(\mathbb{T}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ and there exists $\theta>0$ such that $D^2_{pp}H_i\ge\theta I$ for $i=1,2$, where I is the unit matrix of size n.
- (A4) There exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2C}|p|^2 - C \le H_i(x,p) \le \frac{C}{2}(|p|^2+1) \text{ for } x\in\mathbb{T}^n,\ p\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ i=1,2.$$

Note that in this case we can easily see that $L_i\in C^2(\mathbb{T}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n)$ are uniformly convex and satisfy

$$\frac{1}{2C}|p|^2 - C \le L_i(x,p) \le \frac{C}{2}(|p|^2+1) \text{ for } x\in\mathbb{T}^n,\ p\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ i=1,2. \qquad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(v_1,v_2,0)$ be a solution of* (E). *Then $\mathcal{E}([-1,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))\neq\emptyset$.*

Proof. By (2.2) there exists a sequence of curves $\{\gamma_k\}\subset\mathrm{AC}([-1,0])$ with $\gamma_k(0)=x$ such that

$$v_i(x)+\frac{1}{k} > \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma_k(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(-1)}(\gamma_k(-1))\Big].$$

Since v_i are bounded, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^{0} L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma_k(s))\,ds\Big] \le C \text{ for some } C>0. \qquad (3.2)$$

Combining (3.2) and (3.1), we deduce that $\|\dot\gamma_k\|_{L^2(-1,0)} \le M$ for some $M > 0$. For any $-1 \le a < b \le 0$, we have

$$|\gamma_k(b) - \gamma_k(a)| \le \int_a^b |\dot\gamma_k(s)|\,ds \le \Big[\int_a^b |\dot\gamma_k(s)|^2\,ds\Big]^{1/2}\Big[\int_a^b 1\,ds\Big]^{1/2} \le M|b-a|^{1/2}.$$

By the Arzela–Ascoli theorem and the weak compactness, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, $\{\gamma_k\}$ converges to $\gamma \in \mathrm{AC}([-1,0])$ uniformly, and $\{\dot\gamma_k\}$ converges weakly to $\dot\gamma$ in $L^2(-1,0)$.

Now we prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\Big] \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma_k(s))\,ds\Big]. \tag{3.3}$$

This is a standard part in the theory of calculus of variations but let us present it here for the sake of clarity. The convexity of L_i gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} &L_i(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma_k(s)) \ge L_i(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s)) + D_qL_i(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s))\cdot(\dot\gamma_k(s)-\dot\gamma(s))\\ &= L_i(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s)) + [D_qL_i(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s)) - D_qL_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))]\cdot(\dot\gamma_k(s)-\dot\gamma(s))\\ &\quad + D_qL_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\cdot(\dot\gamma_k(s)-\dot\gamma(s)). \end{aligned}$$

Since γ_k converges uniformly to γ, we employ the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem to get that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\Big] = \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\Big]. \tag{3.4}$$

We use (3.1) again to yield that

$$|D_qL_i(x,q)| \le C(|q|+1) \text{ for } x\in\mathbb{T}^n,\ q\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ i=1,2.$$

It it then straightforward by using the above and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem to see that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 (D_qL_{\nu(s)}(\gamma_k(s),\dot\gamma(s)) - D_qL_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s)))\cdot(\dot\gamma_k(s)-\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\Big] = 0 \tag{3.5}$$

Besides, the weak convergence of $\{\dot\gamma_k\}$ to $\dot\gamma$ in $L^2(-1,0)$ implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 D_qL_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\cdot(\dot\gamma_k(s)-\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\Big] = 0.$$

We combine (3.4), (3.5), and the above to get (3.3). Thus, γ satisfies

$$v_i(x) \ge \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(-1)}(\gamma(-1))\Big]. \tag{3.6}$$

On the other hand, for any $-1 \leq a < b \leq 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&v_i(x) \leq \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_b^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(b)}(\gamma(b))\Big],\\
&\mathbb{E}_i[v_{\nu(b)}(\gamma(b))] \leq \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_a^b L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(a)}(\gamma(a))\Big],\\
&\mathbb{E}_i[v_{\nu(a)}(\gamma(a))] \leq \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-1}^a L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + v_{\nu(-1)}(\gamma(-1))\Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

The above inequalities together with (3.6) yield the conclusion that $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}([-1,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$.
□

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $i \in \{1,2\}$. We define the sequence $\{\gamma^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathrm{AC}\,([-k,-k+1])$ recursively as $\gamma^k \in \mathcal{E}([-k,-k+1],x_{k-1},i,(v_1,v_2))$, where $x_k := \gamma^k(-k)$ and $x_0 = x$. Define the curve $\gamma \in \mathrm{AC}\,((-\infty,0])$ by $\gamma(s) = \gamma^k(s)$ for $s \in [-k,-k+1]$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it is clear to see that $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$. □

4. Stability on the Extremal Curves

In this section, we establish the following stability result, which plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 4.1 (Scaling Result)**.** *Let $(v_1,v_2,0)$ be a solution of* (E). *For any $\tau, T \in (0,\infty)$ with $\tau < T$ such that $\tau/(T-\tau) < \delta_0$, where δ_0 appears in Lemma* 4.3, *and $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$, we have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&u_i(x,T) - \mathbb{E}_i[u_{\nu(-T)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)]\\
&\leq v_i(x) - \mathbb{E}_i[v_{\nu(-T)}(\gamma(-T))] + (1+\frac{\tau T}{T-\tau})\omega(\frac{\tau}{T-\tau})
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1}
$$

for a fuction $\omega : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ which is continuous and $\omega(0) = 0$.

Lemma 4.2. *For any $T > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$. There exists $(p_1,p_2) \in L^\infty((-T,0),\mathbb{R}^n)^2$ such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&L_i(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t)) + H_i(\gamma(t),p_i(t)) = p_i(t)\cdot\dot\gamma(t),\\
&H_i(\gamma(t),p_i(t)) + v_i(\gamma(t)) - v_j(\gamma(t)) = 0,\ \text{and } p_i(t) \in \partial_c v_i(\gamma(t))
\end{aligned}
$$

for a.e. $t \in (-T,0)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.6 there exists $(p_1,p_2) \in L^\infty((-T,0),\mathbb{R}^n)^2$ such that $p_i(t) \in \partial_c v_i(\gamma(t))$ for *a.e.* $t \in (-T,0)$ and satisfies (2.5) in the proof of Proposition 2.5. Also, note that by the convexity of H_i and the definition of L_i, we have $H_i(\gamma(t),p_i(t)) + v_i(\gamma(t)) - v_j(\gamma(t)) \leq 0$ and $H_i(\gamma(t),p_i(t)) + L(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t)) \geq p_i(t)\cdot\dot\gamma(t)$ for *a.e.* $t \in (-T,0)$ and $i = 1,2$. Since γ is an extremal curve, all inequalities above must become the equalities, which give the desired conclusion. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ *be a solution of* (E)*. There exists* $\delta_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $\varepsilon \in [0, \delta_0]$ *and* $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty, 0], x, i, (v_1, v_2))$ *we have*

$$L_i(\gamma(t), (1+\varepsilon)\dot{\gamma}(t)) \le (1+\varepsilon)L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) - \varepsilon(v_i - v_j)(\gamma(t)) + \varepsilon\omega(\varepsilon)$$

for a fuction $\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ *which is continuous and* $\omega(0) = 0$*.*

Proof. Let (p_1, p_2) be the pair of functions given by Lemma 4.2. We notice that

$$H_i(\gamma(t), p_i(t)) + H_j(\gamma(t), p_j(t)) = 0 \text{ for a.e. } t \in (-\infty, 0]$$

by Lemma 4.2. Set

$$\begin{aligned} Q &:= \{(x, p_1, p_2) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \mid H_1(x, p_1) + H_2(x, p_2) = 0\}, \\ S &:= \{(x, q_1, q_2) \mid q_i \in D_p^- H_i(x, p_i) \text{ for some } (x, p_1, p_2) \in Q\} \end{aligned}$$

and then Q and S are compact in $\mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ in view of the coercivity of H_i. We notice that $(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \in S$ for a.e. $t \in (-\infty, 0)$ and thus $|\dot{\gamma}(t)| \le M$ for some $M > 0$. We choose $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that $(x, (1+\varepsilon)\dot{\gamma}) \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom} L_1 \cap \operatorname{dom} L_2)$ for all $\varepsilon \in [0, \delta_0]$, where $\operatorname{dom} L_i := \{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid L_i(x, \xi) < \infty\}$.

By Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) &= p_i(t) \cdot \dot{\gamma}(t) - H_i(\gamma(t), p_i(t)) \\ &= D_q L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \cdot \dot{\gamma}(t) + (v_i - v_j)(\gamma(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Note that since $H_i(x, \cdot)$ are strictly convex, $D_q L_i(x, \xi)$ exists, and is continuous on $\operatorname{dom} L_i$.

Due to the mean value theorem and (4.2), there exists $\theta_t \in (0, 1)$ and a fuction $\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ which is continuous and $\omega(0) = 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} L_i(\gamma(t), (1+\varepsilon)\dot{\gamma}(t)) &= L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) + \varepsilon D_q L_i(\gamma(t), (1+\theta_t\varepsilon)\dot{\gamma}(t)) \cdot \dot{\gamma}(t) \\ &\le L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) + \varepsilon D_q L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \cdot \dot{\gamma}(t) + \varepsilon|\dot{\gamma}(t)|\omega(\varepsilon|\dot{\gamma}(t)|) \\ &\le (1+\varepsilon)L_i(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) - \varepsilon(v_i - v_j)(\gamma(t)) + \varepsilon\tilde{\omega}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $\tilde{\omega}(r) := M \max_{s \in [0, Mr]} \omega(s)$. □

Remark 4.4. We notice that the result of Lemma 4.3 is different from the similar one for single equations (see [8, Lemma 7.2] for details). More precisely, the natural appearance of the coupling terms $-\varepsilon(v_i - v_j)(\gamma(t))$ makes the analysis for weakly coupled systems more difficult. We could not proceed to establish large time behavior results in a crude way. It turns out that the weights $(1/2)(1 + e^{2t})$ and $(1/2)(1 - e^{2t})$ for $t < 0$ are the key factors helping us overcome this difficulty as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 below.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Set $\varepsilon := \tau/(T - \tau)$ and $T_\varepsilon := T/(1+\varepsilon)$. Notice that $T = T_\varepsilon + \varepsilon T_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon + \tau$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &u_i(x, T) = u_i(\gamma(0), T) = u_i(\gamma(0), T_\varepsilon + \tau) \\ &= \inf\Big\{\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T_\varepsilon}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\eta(s), \dot{\eta}(s))\,ds + u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\eta(-T_\varepsilon), \tau)\Big] \mid \eta \in \mathrm{AC}([-T_\varepsilon, 0]) \text{ with } \eta(0) = x\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(v_1,v_2))$ and set $\eta(s) := \gamma((1+\varepsilon)s)$ to derive that

$$u_i(x,T) \le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T_\varepsilon}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma((1+\varepsilon)s),(1+\varepsilon)\dot\gamma((1+\varepsilon)s))\,ds + u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\Big].$$

Make the change of variable $t=(1+\varepsilon)s$ and use Lemma 2.2 to get

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(x,T) \le& \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T}^0 \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} L_{\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))}(\gamma(t),(1+\varepsilon)\dot\gamma(t))\,dt + u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\Big] && (4.3)\\ =& \int_{-T}^0 \frac{1+e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}}{2(1+\varepsilon)} L_i(\gamma(t),(1+\varepsilon)\dot\gamma(t))\,dt + \int_{-T}^0 \frac{1-e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}}{2(1+\varepsilon)} L_j(\gamma(t),(1+\varepsilon)\dot\gamma(t))\,dt \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_i\big[u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\big]. && (4.4)\end{aligned}$$

We use Lemma 4.3 in the above inequality to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &u_i(x,T) - \mathbb{E}_i\big[u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\big]\\ \le& \int_{-T}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)})L_i(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t)) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)})L_j(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))\,dt\\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\int_{-T}^0 e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}(v_j-v_i)(\gamma(t))\,dt + T\varepsilon\omega(\varepsilon). \qquad (4.5)\end{aligned}$$

We use the fact that $v_j - v_i$ is bounded in $\mathbb{T}^n$ to derive that

$$\Big|\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\int_{-T}^0 e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}(v_j-v_i)(\gamma(t))\,dt\Big| \le C\varepsilon \int_{-T}^0 e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}\,dt \le C\varepsilon. \qquad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, for $t<0$, $|e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)} - e^{2t}| \le -2t\varepsilon e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}$. This together with the facts that u_i are bounded and $|\dot\gamma(t)| \le M$ imply $\mathbb{E}_i\big[u_{\nu(-T_\varepsilon)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\big] \le \mathbb{E}_i\big[u_{\nu(-T)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\big] + C\varepsilon$, and

$$\Big|\int_{-T}^0 (e^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)} - e^{2t})L_k(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))\,dt\Big| \le -C_1\varepsilon\int_{-T}^0 te^{2t/(1+\varepsilon)}\,dt \le C_2\varepsilon,$$

for $k=1,2$ and $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of ε.

Summing up everything, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &u_i(x,T) - \mathbb{E}_i\big[u_{\nu(-T)}(\gamma(-T),\tau)\big]\\ \le& \int_{-T}^0 \Big[\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2t})L_i(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t)) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2t})L_j(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))\Big]\,dt + C\varepsilon + T\varepsilon\omega(\varepsilon)\\ =& v_i(x) - \mathbb{E}_i\big[v_{\nu(-T)}(\gamma(-T))\big] + C\frac{\tau}{T-\tau} + \frac{\tau T}{T-\tau}\omega(\frac{\tau}{T-\tau}),\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired conclusion. □

Remark 4.5. The new representation formula (2.1) with the weights $(1/2)(1+e^{2t})$ and $(1/2)(1-e^{2t})$ for $t<0$ appears naturally in both the statement and the proof of Theorem 4.1 pointing out a major difference between single equations and weakly coupled systems. With new representation formula (2.1), we could explicitly calculate (4.4) and (4.5) and thus identify the main obstacle coming from the coupling term, the second last term in

(4.5). As mentioned in Remark 4.4, we could not estimate the coupling term in a crude way. For instance, in (4.3) we can easily see by Lemma 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T}^{0}\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}L_{\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))}(\gamma(t),(1+\varepsilon)\dot\gamma(t))\,dt\Big]\\
&\le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T}^{0}L_{\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))}(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))-\frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}(v_{\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))}-v_{3-\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))})\,dt\Big]+\varepsilon T\omega(\varepsilon)\\
&\le \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-T}^{0}L_{\nu(t/(1+\varepsilon))}(\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))\,dt\Big]+\varepsilon T\omega(\varepsilon)+CT\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}$$

by using the fact that $\|v_1-v_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n)}\le C$. But the last term in the above, which is of order $O(\tau)$ and does not vanish as $\varepsilon\to 0$, is not enough to get the large-time asymptotics as we can see in the proof of Theorem 1.1. It turns out that the weights played an essential role here and helped us in establishing the key estimate (4.6) leading to the large time behavior result.

5. The Proof of Convergence

We define the functions $u^-_{g_i}$ and $\underline{u}_i$ $(i=1,2)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
u^-_{g_i}(x)&:=\sup\{\phi_i(x)\,|\,(\phi_i,\phi_j)\text{ is a subsolution of (E) with }\phi_i\le g_i,\ \phi_j\le g_j\},\\
\underline{u}_i(x)&:=\inf\{\psi_i(x)\,|\,(\psi_i,\psi_j)\text{ is a solution of (E) with }\psi_i\ge u^-_{g_i},\ \psi_j\ge u^-_{g_j}\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we take j so that $\{i,j\}=\{1,2\}$. Notice first that the pair $(\underline{u}_1,\underline{u}_2)$ is a solution of (E) because of the convexity of the Hamiltonians H_i for $i=1,2$. Let $(T_t)_{t\ge 0}$ be the semigroup defined by $(T_tg_i)(x):=u_i(x,t)$, where (u_1,u_2) is the unique solution of (C) with a given initial data (g_1,g_2).

Lemma 5.1. *We have* $(T_tu^-_{g_i})(x)=\inf_{s\ge t}u_i(x,s)$, *and* $\underline{u}_i(x)=\liminf_{s\to\infty}u_i(x,s)$ *for* $x\in\mathbb{T}^n$ *and* $i=1,2$.

Remark 5.2. In view of the uniform continuity of u_i on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$, we have $\liminf_{t\to\infty}u_i(x,t)=\liminf^*_{t\to\infty}u_i(x,t):=\lim_{r\to 0}\inf\{u_i(y,s)\mid |x-y|\le r, s\ge 1/r\}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{T}^n$.

Proof. Let $w_i(x,t):=\inf_{s\ge t}u_i(x,s)$ for $i=1,2$ and $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$. Noting that $(u^-_{g_1},u^-_{g_2})$ is a subsolution of (E) and $u^-_{g_i}\le g_i$, we get by the comparison principle

$$u^-_{g_i}(x)\le (T_sg^-_i)(x)\le (T_sg_i)(x)=u_i(x,s).$$

We use the comparison principle again to deduce that

$$(T_tu^-_{g_i})(x)\le (T_tu_i)(x,s)=u_i(x,t+s)\text{ for all }s\ge 0.$$

Hence $(T_tu^-_{g_i})(x)\le\inf_{s\ge t}u_i(x,s)=w_i(x,t)$ for all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$.

On the other hand, (w_1,w_2) is a solution of (C) by the convexity of H_i. Moreover, w_i are increasing in the t-variable for $i=1,2$ by definition, which give us in addition that $(w_1(\cdot,t),w_2(\cdot,t))$ is a subsolution of (E) for all $t\ge 0$. In particular, $(w_1(\cdot,0),w_2(\cdot,0))$ is a subsolution of (E) with $w_i\le g_i$, which implies $w_i\le u^-_{g_i}$. Thus, the comparison principle yields $w_i(\cdot,t)\le (T_tu^-_{g_i})(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{T}^n$ for all $t\ge 0$.

Next, note that

$$\liminf_{s\to\infty} u_i(x,s) = \lim_{t\to\infty}(T_t u_{g_i}^-)(x) \le \lim_{t\to\infty}(T_t\underline{u}_i)(x) = \underline{u}_i(x) \text{ for } i=1,2,\ x\in\mathbb{T}^n.$$

Due to the fact that $(T_t u_{g_i}^-)(x) = w_i(x,t)$ are increasing in the t-variable for $i=1,2$, we see that $(\lim_{t\to\infty} w_1(\cdot,t), \lim_{t\to\infty} w_2(\cdot,t))$ is a solution of (E). Therefore, by the definition of $(\underline{u}_1,\underline{u}_2)$ we deduce that $\lim_{t\to\infty} w_i(\cdot,t) \ge \underline{u}_i$ on $\mathbb{T}^n$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Set $\overline{u}_i(x) := \limsup_{t\to\infty} u_i(x,t)$. By Lemma (5.1) we have $\underline{u}_i \le \overline{u}_i$ on $\mathbb{T}^n$. We now prove that $\underline{u}_i = \overline{u}_i$ on $\mathbb{T}^n$ for $i=1,2$.

Were the above statement false, there would exist a point $x\in\mathbb{T}^n$ such that

$$\max_{i=1,2}\max_{z\in\mathbb{T}^n}(\overline{u}_i - \underline{u}_i)(z) = (\overline{u}_i - \underline{u}_i)(x) =: \alpha > 0.$$

Take $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}((-\infty,0],x,i,(\underline{u}_1,\underline{u}_2))$. We can choose a sequence $\{T_m\}\subset(0,\infty)$ converging to ∞ such that $\lim_{m\to\infty} u_i(x,T_m) = \overline{u}_i(x) > \underline{u}_i(x)$. Without loss of generality, we assume further that $\gamma(-T_m)\to y\in\mathbb{T}^n$ as $m\to\infty$.

Fix $\delta>0$ and choose $\tau>0$ large enough such that $u_i(y,\tau) < \underline{u}_i(y)+\alpha/2$ and $u_j(y,\tau) < \overline{u}_j(y)+\alpha/2$. Notice that the first constraint requires τ to be specific while the second constraint only requires τ to be large enough. We apply Theorem 4.1 to get

$$\begin{aligned}&u_i(x,T_m) - \Big\{\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2T_m})u_i(\gamma(-T_m),\tau) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2T_m})u_j(\gamma(-T_m),\tau)\Big\}\\ \le{}& \underline{u}_i(x) - \Big\{\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2T_m})\underline{u}_i(\gamma(-T_m)) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2T_m})\underline{u}_j(\gamma(-T_m))\Big\} + (1+\frac{\tau T_m}{T_m-\tau})\omega(\frac{\tau}{T_m-\tau})\end{aligned}$$

for m large enough. Let $m\to\infty$ in the above inequality to yield

$$\overline{u}_i(x) - \frac{1}{2}(u_i(y,\tau)+u_j(y,\tau)) \le \underline{u}_i(x) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{u}_i(y)+\underline{u}_j(y)),$$

which contradicts the choice of τ. This finishes the proof. □

6. Appendix

Let u_i be the value function associated with (1.1), or equivalently the function defined by the right hand side of (2.1).

Proposition 6.1 (Dynamic Programming Principle)**.** *For any $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $0\le h\le t$ and $i=1,2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}u_i(x,t) = \inf\Big\{&\int_{-h}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})u_i(\gamma(-h),t-h)\\ &+\int_{-h}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})u_j(\gamma(-h),t-h)\ \mid\ \gamma\in \mathrm{AC}([-h,0]),\ \gamma(0)=x\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. We denote by $w_i(x,t,h)$ the right hand side of (6.1). For any $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}([-t,0])$ with $\gamma(0)=x$, set $\eta(s)=\gamma(s+h)$ for $s\in[-t+h,0]$. Note that for $s<0$,

$$\frac{1}{2}(1\pm e^{2(s-h)}) = \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})\cdot\frac{1}{2}(1\pm e^{2s}) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})\cdot\frac{1}{2}(1\mp e^{2s}),$$

which actually comes from the memoryless property of Markov processes. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-t}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2t})g_i(\gamma(-t))\\
&\quad+\int_{-t}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2t})g_j(\gamma(-t))\\
&=\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})\Big[\int_{-t+h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\eta(s),\dot\eta(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2(t-h)})g_i(\eta(-t+h))\\
&\quad+\int_{-t+h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\eta(s),\dot\eta(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2(t-h)})g_j(\eta(-t+h))\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})\Big[\int_{-t+h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_i(\eta(s),\dot\eta(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2(t-h)})g_i(\eta(-t+h))\\
&\quad+\int_{-t+h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_j(\eta(s),\dot\eta(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2(t-h)})g_j(\eta(-t+h))\Big]\\
&\ge\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})u_i(\gamma(-h),t-h)\\
&\quad+\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})u_j(\gamma(-h),t-h),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $u_i(x,t)\ge w_i(x,t,h)$ for $i=1,2$.

We also can prove the other inequalities by a similar way. Thus, we omit the details. ☐

Proposition 6.2. *The functions u_i are continuous on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$.*

Proof. We first prove that u_i are Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$ under the additional assumption that g_i are Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{T}^n$. This additional requirement on g_i will be removed at the end of the proof.

We may choose a constant $M_1>0$ so that $H_i(x,Dg_i(x))+(g_i-g_j)(x)\le M_1$ for a.e. $x\in\mathbb{T}^n$. It is clear that the function $v_i(x,t):=g_i(x)-M_1t$ on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$ is a subsolution of (C).

By a similar argument to the proof of Proposition 2.5 we obtain

$$v_i(x,t)\le\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0}L_{\nu(s)}(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+v_{\nu(-t)}(\gamma(-t),0)\Big]$$

for all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$ and $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$ with $\gamma(0)=x$, from which we get $g_i(x)-M_1t\le u_i(x,t)$ for all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$.

It follows from (2.1) that

$$u_i(x,t)\le\mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-t}^{0}L_{\nu(s)}(x,0)\,ds+g_{\nu(-t)}(x)\Big]\le g_i(x)+C_1t$$

for $C_1 := \max\{M_1, \max_{i=1,2;\, x\in\mathbb{T}^n}|L_i(x,0)| + \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^n}|g_1(x)-g_2(x)|\}$, and all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$. Therefore we get

$$|u_i(x,t)-g_i(x)| \le C_1 t \text{ for all } (x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty). \tag{6.2}$$

Now, for any $(x,t)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times(0,\infty)$ and $h>0$, by Dynamic Programming Principle (6.1),

$$u_i(x,t+h) = \inf\Big\{\int_{-t}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_i(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds + \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2t})u_i(\gamma(-t),h)$$
$$+\int_{-t}^0 \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_j(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2t})u_j(\gamma(-t),h) \ \mid\ \gamma\in \mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0]),\ \gamma(0)=x\Big\}.$$

By (6.2), $|u_i(\gamma(-t),h)-g_i(\gamma(-t),h)|\le C_1 h$ for $i=1,2$. Hence, we derive that

$$|u_i(x,t+h)-u_i(x,t)|\le C_1 h. \tag{6.3}$$

We next prove that u_i are Lipschitz continuous in x for $i=1,2$. Fix $x,y\in\mathbb{T}^n$ with $x\ne y$ and $t>0$. In view of the coercivity of H_i, there exists a constant $\rho>0$ such that $L_i(x,\xi)\le C$ for all $x\in\mathbb{T}^n$ and $\xi\in B(0,\rho)$ (see [8, Proposition 2.1]). Set $\tau := |x-y|/\rho$ and we first consider the case where $\tau<t$. Set $\eta(s) := y - s\rho(x-y)/|x-y|$ for $s\in[-\tau,0]$. Note that $\eta\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-t,0])$, $\eta(0)=y$ and $\eta(-\tau)=x$. By Dynamic Programming Principle (6.1), (6.2) and (6.3),

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(y,t) \le& \mathbb{E}_i\Big[\int_{-\tau}^0 L_{\nu(s)}(\eta(s),\dot\eta(s))\,ds + u_{\nu(-\tau)}(\eta(-\tau),t-\tau)\Big] \\ \le& C\tau + \frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2\tau})u_i(x,t-\tau) + \frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2\tau})u_j(x,t-\tau) \\ \le& (C+2C_1t)\tau + u_i(x,t) \le C|x-y| + u_i(x,t), \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry we conclude $|u_i(x,t)-u_i(y,t)|\le C|x-y|$, where C depends on t as calculated above. Notice that this is just a fairly crude estimate, but it is good enough for our presentation here.

We consider the case where $t\le\tau$. By (6.2),

$$\begin{aligned} |u_i(x,t)-u_i(y,t)| &\le |u_i(x,t)-g_i(x)| + |g_i(x)-g_i(y)| + |g_i(y)-u_i(y,t)| \\ &\le 2Ct + M|x-y| \le C|x-y|, \end{aligned}$$

where $M := \max_{i=1,2}\|Dg_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n)}$. Thus, we get $|u_i(x,t)-u_i(y,t)|\le C|x-y|$ for all $x,y\in\mathbb{T}^n, t\ge 0$ and $i=1,2$.

We finally remark that we can deduce the continuity of u_i by using an approximation argument. We may choose a sequence $\{g_i^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Lipschitz continuous functions so that $\|g_i^k-g_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^n)}\le 1/k$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Let u_i^k be functions defined by (2.1) with given g_i^k. By comparison through the formulas for u_i and u_i^k, we see that $|u_i(x,t)-u_i^k(x,t)|\le \max_{\mathbb{T}^n}|g_i-g_i^k|$. Since $u_i^k\in \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty))$ by the above argument for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and u_i^k converges uniformly to u_i on $\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty)$, we obtain $u_i\in\mathrm{C}(\mathbb{T}^n\times[0,\infty))$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4. It is clear that $(u_1,u_2)(\cdot,0)=(g_1,g_2)$ on $\mathbb{T}^n$. We now prove that u_1 is a subsolution of (C). Take a test function $\phi\in C^1(\mathbb{T}^n\times(0,\infty))$ such that $u_1-\phi$ has a maximum at $(x_0,t_0)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times(0,\infty)$ and $(u_1-\phi)(x_0,t_0)=0$. Take $h>0$ small enough. By Proposition 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned}u_1(x_0,t_0)\le&\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_1(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})u_1(\gamma(-h),t_0-h)\\&+\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_2(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})u_2(\gamma(-h),t_0-h)\end{aligned}$$

for any $\gamma\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-h,0])$ with $\gamma(0)=x_0$ and $\dot\gamma(0)=q\in\mathbb{R}^n$. We now use the fact $u_1(\gamma(-h),t_0-h)\le\phi(\gamma(-h),t_0-h)$ to plug into the above to derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\phi(\gamma(0),t_0)-\phi(\gamma(-h),t_0-h)}{h}\le&\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_1(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds\\&+\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_2(\gamma(s),\dot\gamma(s))\,ds+\frac{1-e^{-2h}}{2h}(u_2-u_1)(\gamma(-h),t_0-h).\end{aligned}$$

Sending $h\to0$, we obtain

$$\phi_t(x_0,t_0)+D\phi(x_0,t_0)\cdot q\le L_1(x_0,q)+(u_2-u_1)(x_0,t_0)\text{ for all }q\in\mathbb{R}^n,$$

which implies $\phi_t(x_0,t_0)+H_1(x_0,D\phi(x_0,t_0))+(u_1-u_2)(x_0,t_0)\le0$.

Next we prove that u_1 is a supersolution of (C). Take a test function $\phi\in C^1(\mathbb{T}^n\times(0,\infty))$ such that $u_1-\phi$ has a minimum at $(x_0,t_0)\in\mathbb{T}^n\times(0,\infty)$ and $(u_1-\phi)(x_0,t_0)=0$. Take $h>0$ small enough. By Proposition 6.1, there exists $\gamma_h\in\mathrm{AC}\,([-h,0])$ with $\gamma_h(0)=x_0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}u_1(x_0,t_0)+h^2\ge&\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_1(\gamma_h(s),\dot\gamma_h(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{-2h})u_1(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h)\\&+\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_2(\gamma_h(s),\dot\gamma_h(s))\,ds+\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{-2h})u_2(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h).\end{aligned}$$

We use $u_1(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h)\ge\phi(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h)$ in the above to yield

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\phi(\gamma_h(0),t_0)-\phi(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h)}{h}+h\ge&\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})L_1(\gamma_h(s),\dot\gamma_h(s))\,ds\\&+\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})L_2(\gamma_h(s),\dot\gamma_h(s))\,ds+\frac{1-e^{-2h}}{2h}(u_2-u_1)(\gamma(-h),t_0-h).\end{aligned}\tag{6.4}$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\phi(\gamma_h(0),t_0)-\phi(\gamma_h(-h),t_0-h)}{h}\\
=&\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\phi_t(\gamma_h(s),t_0-s)+D\phi(\gamma_h(s),t_0-s)\cdot\dot{\gamma}_h(s)\,ds\\
\le&\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\phi_t(\gamma_h(s),t_0-s)\,ds\\
&+\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1+e^{2s})\Big\{L_1(\gamma_h(s),\dot{\gamma}_h(s))+H_1(\gamma_h(s),D\phi(\gamma_h(s),t_0-s))\Big\}\,ds\\
&+\frac{1}{h}\int_{-h}^{0}\frac{1}{2}(1-e^{2s})\Big\{L_2(\gamma_h(s),\dot{\gamma}_h(s))+H_2(\gamma_h(s),D\phi(\gamma_h(s),t_0-s))\Big\}\,ds. \qquad (6.5)
\end{aligned}
$$

Combine (6.4), (6.5) and then send $h\to 0$ to get

$$\phi_t(x_0,t_0)+H_1(x_0,D\phi(x_0,t_0))+(u_1-u_2)(x_0,t_0)\ge 0.$$

It is easy to see the uniform continuity of u_i due to the coercivity of Hamiltonians. □

References

1. G. Barles and P. E. Souganidis, *On the large time behavior of solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **31** (2000), no. 4, 925–939.
2. F. Cagnetti, D. Gomes, H. Mitake and H. V. Tran, paper to appear.
3. F. Cagnetti, D. Gomes and H. V. Tran, *Adjoint methods for obstacle problems and weakly coupled systems of PDE*, to appear in ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.
4. F. Camilli, O. Ley, P. Loreti and V. Nguyen, *Large time behavior of weakly coupled systems of first-order Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, to appear in NoDEA.
5. A. Davini and A. Siconolfi, *A generalized dynamical approach to the large-time behavior of solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **38** (2006), no. 2, 478–502.
6. H. Engler, S. M. Lenhart, *Viscosity solutions for weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **63** (1991), no. 1, 212–240.
7. A. Fathi, *Sur la convergence du semi-groupe de Lax-Oleinik*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **327** (1998), no. 3, 267–270.
8. H. Ishii, *Asymptotic solutions for large-time of Hamilton–Jacobi equations in Euclidean n space*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **25** (2008), no 2, 231–266.
9. H. Ishii and S. Koike, *Viscosity solutions for monotone systems of second-order elliptic PDEs*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **16** (1991), no. 6-7, 1095–1128.
10. P.-L., Lions, G. Papanicolaou and S. R. S. Varadhan, Homogenization of Hamilton–Jacobi equations, unpublished work (1987).
11. H. Mitake, H. V. Tran, *Remarks on the large-time behavior of viscosity solutions of quasi-monotone weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, Asymptot. Anal., **77** (2012), 43–70.
12. H. Mitake, H. V. Tran, *Homogenization of weakly coupled systems of Hamilton–Jacobi equations with fast switching rates*, submitted.
13. G. Namah and J.-M. Roquejoffre, *Remarks on the long time behaviour of the solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **24** (1999), no. 5-6, 883–893.
14. J.-M. Roquejoffre, *Convergence to steady states or periodic solutions in a class of Hamilton–Jacobi equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **80** (2001), no. 1, 85–104.

(H. Mitake) Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Fukuoka University, Fukuoka 814-0180, Japan
E-mail address: `mitake@math.sci.fukuoka-u.ac.jp`

(H. V. Tran) Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago, 5734 S. University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA
E-mail address: `tvhung@math.berkeley.edu`